Mr. Paul Rothermel, Jr.
2406 Little Creek Drive
Richardson, Tx. 75080

2/3/76

Dear Paul,

Thanks for the clippings on the obstruction of justice case. I do want to keep up with it, especially Foreman, who has little likelihood of punishment even if convicted because of his age. I'mall for people having effective counsel but this man has made a career of seeing to it that justice would not be done. The corruption in this case is only one illustration. The one I've been working on would have been one of his very easiest - and most spectacular. He deliberately forced Ray to cop a plea with a lead-pipe cinch case. So, I wonder why. Perhaps we've discussed this.

Sorry I haven't been able to get down there. The colleges go for the nuts, the extremists and the showmen who have little concern for fact, so my lecture bureau, now that I have one, has booked me less than I've booked myself through them. Now I travel only when I must not to overdo it. The phlebitis lingers and I'm being careful. My last appearance, on a conservative campus, led to inquiries by a much more conservative nearby college. The truth has universal appeal, crossing all political lines. I'm sorry no school in or near Dallas has had any interest. It is the only way I'll be able to get there and there is much about which I'd like to talk to you.

Because I have to type in an uncomfortable position, with both legs horizontal, I'll ask you about one. I think I did a while back but maybe only thought of it.

I have no trouble taking your word when you say you did not work for the CIA. And it would make no real difference to me if you did anyway. I used to work for OSS.

What I am interested in is how the CIA got what had to have come from you, directly or indirectly. They do have this relating to me and they have lied and said they do not. I have copies, on a confidential basis unless I have to use them in court. The information is also accurate, so I don't think it was a third or fourth-hand deal. Therefore, I assume it was relayed by someone to whom you spoke. Nothing wrong with that. Nor, in your position, would there have been anything wrong with contact with someone in a CIA station or base. They have a perfectly proper interest in pil, for example.

My interest is not in prying into your affairs. It is in being able to pinpoint what files they know they should have searched and haven't, things like that. They are supposed to be responding to my requests under the Freedom of Information and Privacy Acts. I have enormously more that they have that they haven't given me. Meanwhile, as they have all along, they have been stonewalling. The time to comply with or respond to the last step in what is euphemistically called "administrative remedies" expired more than two weeks ago. I don't want to sue needlessly and I don't want to embarrass the Agency needlessly but I suspect they are hungup. I'm sure I know why and I think their hangups have blinded their judgement. They'll be hurt more- and worse- if I have to go to court. I realize they have a problem in not knowing what I know and have, but I was forthright with their general counsel a year and a month ago. Wittingly or not he lied. Because he is a lifetime spook I assume wittingly. I also told him enough so he should have asked questions when he got a total negative. But assuming there was the charade that others kept him unwitting, you can see how my being able to pinpoint rather than generalize should be helpful. I think, as a matter of fact, to them, too. Including individuals because if I am forced to go to court, patient as I've been, I'm going to invoke the punitive provisions of the new law. And they are crazy to force me to court when they have their current problems and legislation is under consideration.

If you know anything or have any theories about who planted that non-story about Hosty I'm interested in that, too. And the remarkable coincidence that it wasn't done until Shanklin retired. Thanks and best regards,